SUBJECTS.

*Dewan's reply.*—The suggestion of the member is noted.

## VAIKAM TALUK.

164. *Settlement grievances.*

*Mr. P. C. Krishna Pillai* spoke about Settlement grievances and said—

(1) that the rates of assessment fixed in the taluk were unduly high, and the *tharams* have been altered at the will and pleasure of officers since division into blocks:

(2) that taxes should be fixed only with reference to present area:

(3) that the same assessment has been fixed on reclaimed and unreclaimed paddy lands:

(4) that the Settlement department should not interfere with the assessment fixed by the Revenue department in the case of enfranchised viruthi lands:

(5) that the rates applied to garden and dry lands should be made applicable to the trees standing on them:

(6) that, when excesses found in registered holdings were treated as puduval, they should be exempted from the payment of *tharavila*:

(7) that the acreage value on puduvals should be reduced from five years' assessment to three years', and refunds granted in the cases of prices already realised:

(8) that the term *muppara* has been misconstrued into assessment at threefold:

(9) that the sites of groves, places of private worship, tanks for irrigation purposes, churches and burial grounds be exempted from payment of tax:

(10) that excesses over ayacut measurements in the case of Jenmom properties should not be treated as Pandarapattom:

(11) that the assessment of $3\frac{9}{16}$ fanams for Kettuthengu is exorbitant:

(12) that Jenmom properties as also properties charged with Kadama, should not be subjected to Ottivilakkam:

(13) that excesses over ayacut measurements in properties surrounded by registered holdings should not be treated as puduval:

(14) that the rice lands which have to be periodically left fallow should not be taxed in years of fallow: and

(15) that, in the case of Kanapattom lands, instead of levying Rajabhogam at the uniform rate of $\frac{1}{8}$ of the assessment, departures are being made by adopting the old rates.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

*Dewan's reply.*—The memorial presented by the ryots of the Vaikam Taluk is now under the consideration of Government. The report of the Settlement Dewan Peishkar has been received and will be disposed of in due course. The Peishkar, however, says that the rates are moderate and fair, and that the mistake, if any, has been in unduly lowering the rates. As regards the allegation that the *tharams* have been altered since the block division, it is observed that the rates fixed by the subordinate officers of the Settlement department are always subject to revision by the superior officers of that department. I mention all these circumstances so that you may know where the matter stands. But Government have not yet passed final orders on the memorial. They will give it due consideration and dispose of it.

## ETTUMANUR TALUK.

**165. Protection of lands against flood.**

*Mr. Itti Avira Punnoose* urged that steps be taken to protect lands near Valianapuzha, Kaipuzha and other places, against damage by floods.

*Dewan's reply.*—From enquiry, we find that a substantial bund will cost about half a lakh of rupees. There is, therefore, no chance of this being done. The best thing is to keep the ordinary earthen bunds and maintain them properly year after year.

**166. Hospital and Vaidyasalas.**

The member also asked for a hospital at Ettumanur and Vaidyasalas in the provertis.

*Dewan's reply.*—The hospital at Kottayam is only 7 miles from Ettumanur. A hospital at Ettumanur is not therefore considered necessary. As regards Vaidyasalas, it is not possible to open one in each proverti as suggested by the member.

*Mr. R. Narayana Pillai* brought forward some grievances regarding settlement; and the Dewan said that the memorandum given by the member will be perused and orders passed.

## KOTTAYAM TALUK.

**167. Aruthootty canal.**

*Mr. C. J. Kurien* spoke of the necessity for widening the Aruthootty canal.

*Dewan's reply.*—A revised estimate for improving this canal has been called for from the Public Works department, as it was discovered that the original estimate required revision. The revised estimate when received will be considered and disposed of.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly